APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/939,136	08/24/2001	Scott T. Brown	CSP-1	2977

21833 7590 01/04/2005	EXAMINER
PRITZKAU PATENT GROUP, LLC	HERNANDEZ, OLGA

PRITZKAU PATENT GROUP, LLC
993 GAPTER ROAD
BOULDER, CO 80303

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2144	

DATE MAILED: 01/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/939,136	BROWN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Olga Hernandez	2144	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 August 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-74* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-74* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *8/24/01* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12202;22202*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on
> sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2.   Claims 1-21, 23-27, 32-42, 62, 63, 68, 73 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as

being anticipated by Anderson et al (5,832,227).

        As per claims 1, 32, 35, 41, 63, 73 and 74, Anderson discloses:

-       after the e-mail message has been originated by an originating user of the

        first user group, directing the e-mail message onto an e-mail

        enhancement path (column 2, lines 35-37, 45-56, column 9, lines 64-65);

-       adding additional content to said e-mail message using the e-mail

        enhancement path to produce an enhanced e-mail message (column 2,

        lines 45-57); and

-       thereafter, directing the enhanced e-mail message from the e-mail

        enhancement path to the intended recipient (column 4, lines 38-41,

        column 5, lines 15-18).

        As per claims 2, 10, 36, 40 and 62, Anderson discloses:

-       a first auxiliary server for directing the e-mail message to a first location,

        after said e-mail message has been placed en route to the intended

        recipient (figure 1, column 4, lines 38-41, column 5, lines 15-18); and

-        at the first location, a second auxiliary server for adding additional

content to said e-mail message to produce an enhanced e-mail message

and, thereafter, for directing the enhanced e-mail message to the intended

recipient (figure 1, column 4, lines 12-15, column 5, lines 40-43).

As per claims 3 and 12, in programming, an API for application-to-application

communication, usually expressed as **C language** (e.g. Unix) procedure calls. Initially developed

at UC Berkeley, and widely accepted as a de facto standard interface. Protocols that can be

accessed include OSI, XNS, X.25, and **TCP/IP**; and is currently being extended to include

ATM. With encryption, it becomes the secure socket interface.[1] Therefore, Anderson teaches the

use of socket in figure 1, column 9, lines 17-43.

As per claim 4, Api is a set of documented programming routines, provided by the

manufacturer of an application or a device, designed to allow third-party access to functions or

capabilities of the application or device. Used to facilitate the development of value-added

features by parties other than the manufacturer. Therefore, Anderson teaches API access in

figure 1, column 4, lines 38-41, column 5, lines 15-18.

As per claim 5, Anderson discloses altering the e-mail message and directing the altered

message to a second server located on the e-mail enhancement path (figure 1, column 4, lines 12-

15, column 5, lines 40-43).

As per claim 6, Anderson discloses altering the email message, separating and modifying

the header section in a predetermined way (abstract, column 3, lines 18-25).

---

[1] TRA LexiCAT Dictionary Copyright 1995-1998

As per claim 7, Anderson discloses parsing and temporarily storing the originating user and intended recipient information contained in the header section in a designated file separate from the email message (column 5, lines 11-18, column 9, lines 60-67).

As per claim 8, Anderson discloses inactivating said information regarding the originating user and intended recipient contained in the header section, and adding an alternate header section containing active information regarding an alternate sender and an alternate message recipient (column 10, lines 1-15, column 5, lines 39-47).

As per claim 9, Anderson discloses adding a predetermined prefix to the originating user and intended recipient information in the header section such that the information is inactive (column 10, lines 1-2).

As per claim 11, Anderson discloses deleting the alternate header section, and reactivating the originating user and intended recipient information contained in the header section of the e-mail message (column 12, lines 21-41).

As per claim 13, Anderson discloses adding a request for additional content to the e-mail message (column 3, lines 5-17).

As per claim 14, Anderson discloses a validation of the request for additional content such that the additional content is added to the e-mail message responsive to the validation (column 3, lines 43-50, column 4, lines 38-55, column 12).

As per claim 15, Anderson discloses the tag (column 3, lines 5-8, column 9, lines 60-67).

As per claim 16, Anderson discloses assigning desired set of rules for the validation (column 6, lines 50-67).

As per claim 17, Anderson discloses the message ID tag being unique (column 12, lines 15-17).

As per claim 18, Anderson discloses adding a group ID tag for identifying the email message as being sent by the first user group (column 9, lines 60-67).

As per claim 19, Anderson discloses adding a template ID tag for identifying additional content to be added to the email (column 9, lines 60-67, column 3, lines 55-58).

As per claim 20, Anderson discloses adding the template ID tag responsive to an action taken by the originating user (column 10, lines 3-19).

As per claim 21, Anderson discloses adding the template ID tag responsive to an administrative action taken by the originating user (column 10, lines 3-19).

As per claim 23, Anderson discloses information regarding the originating user and the intended recipient, and wherein said step of inserting one or more reference tags into said e-mail message includes the step of adding one or more of said reference tags to the header section of the e-mail message (column 9, lines 55-67).

As per claim 24, Anderson discloses information regarding the originating user and the intended recipient, and wherein said step of inserting one or more reference tags into said e-mail message includes the step of adding one or more of said reference tags to the e-mail message outside of the header section (column 10, lines 54-67).

As per claims 27 and 42, Anderson discloses one or more rich media templates to serve as additional content (column 3, lines 55-58).

As per claims 25, 26 and 39, Anderson discloses an out-going e-mail message path configured for enhancing an out-going e-mail message originated by any user in said first user

group, said out-going e-mail message path being defined at least in part between the first server

and each user of the first user group, and including at least one different node as compared to the

incoming e-mail message path (figure 1, column 2, lines 35-37, 45-61, column 4, lines 53-56,

column 9, lines 64-65).

As per claims 33 and 37, the selection of the message recipient is a user's choice.

As per claims 34 and 38, Anderson discloses routing the in-bound email to one of a

plurality of stations (figure 1).

As per claim 68, Anderson discloses:

-       means for allowing an originating user of the e-mail message to add a

        request for desired additional content to the e-mail message, for

        providing a validation of the request for desired additional content

        according to a set of desired criteria, and for directing the e-mail

        message to a specified location (figure 1, column 3, lines 18-32); and

-       means for performing additional processing located at the specified

        location configured for adding the desired additional content to the e-

        mail message, responsive to said validation, to produce an enhanced e-

        mail message, and for redirecting the enhanced e-mail message to the

        intended recipient (figure 1, column 4, lines 12-15, 49-56, column 5,

        lines 40-43).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 22, 28-30, 43-61, 64-67, 69-71 and 72are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Anderson et al (5,832,227) in view of Bandini et al (2002/0199095).

As per claims 43-61, 64-67, 69-71 and 72, Anderson teaches:

-       after the e-mail message has been originated by an originating user of the

        first user group, directing the e-mail message onto an e-mail

        enhancement path (column 2, lines 35-37, 45-56, column 9, lines 64-65);

-       adding additional content to said e-mail message using the e-mail

        enhancement path to produce an enhanced e-mail message (column 2,

        lines 45-57); and

-       thereafter, directing the enhanced e-mail message from the e-mail

        enhancement path to the intended recipient (column 4, lines 38-41,

        column 5, lines 15-18).

-       a first auxiliary server for directing the e-mail message to a first location,

        after said e-mail message has been placed en route to the intended

        recipient (figure 1, column 4, lines 38-41, column 5, lines 15-18); and

- at the first location, a second auxiliary server for adding additional

content to said e-mail message to produce an enhanced e-mail message

and, thereafter, for directing the enhanced e-mail message to the intended

recipient (figure 1, column 4, lines 12-15, column 5, lines 40-43).

- means for allowing an originating user of the e-mail message to add a

request for desired additional content to the e-mail message, for

providing a validation of the request for desired additional content

according to a set of desired criteria, and for directing the e-mail

message to a specified location (figure 1, column 3, lines 18-32); and

- means for performing additional processing located at the specified

location configured for adding the desired additional content to the e-

mail message, responsive to said validation, to produce an enhanced e-

mail message, and for redirecting the enhanced e-mail message to the

intended recipient (figure 1, column 4, lines 12-15, 49-56, column 5,

lines 40-43).

Moreover, Anderson teaches an out-going e-mail message path configured for enhancing

an out-going e-mail message originated by any user in said first user group, said out-going e-mail

message path being defined at least in part between the first server and each user of the first user

group, and including at least one different node as compared to the incoming e-mail message

path (figure 1, column 2, lines 35-37, 45-56, column 4, lines 53-56, column 9, lines 64-65). In

addition, Anderson discloses a validation of the request for additional content such that the

additional content is added to the e-mail message responsive to the validation (column 3, lines

43-50, column 4, lines 38-55, column 12); the tag (column 3, lines 5-8, column 9, lines 60-67);

assigning desired set of rules for the validation (column 6, lines 50-67).

Anderson does not teach a first enhancement configuration within the firewall, said first

enhancement configuration being configured for adding a request for desired additional content

to the e-mail message, receiving the e-mail message within the firewall, identifying the request

for desired additional content in the received e-mail message, providing a validation of the

request for desired additional content, and directing the received e-mail message to a

predetermined location inside the firewall. However, Bandini teaches it in figure 1 and

paragraphs [0010], [0011], [0036]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art

to combine the aforementioned inventions in order to reduce the number of SPAM messages

received by users of a protected e-mail network.

As per claim 22, Anderson does not teach recording the tag in a database. However,

Bandini teaches it in paragraph [0031]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the

art to combine the aforementioned inventions in order to reduce the number of SPAM messages

received by users of a protected e-mail network.

As per claims 28 and 29, Anderson discloses one or more rich media templates to serve

as additional content (column 3, lines 55-58). Anderson does not teach the use of the Internet.

However, Bandini teaches it in paragraph [0010]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one

skill in the art to combine the aforementioned inventions in order to reduce the number of SPAM

messages received by users of a protected e-mail network.

As per claim 30, Anderson does not teach the use of HTML. However, Bandini teaches

it in paragraph [0031]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art to combine

the aforementioned inventions in order to reduce the number of SPAM messages received by

users of a protected e-mail network.

5.   Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al

(5,832,227) in view of Langseth et al (6,741,980).

> Anderson does not teach the use of footers in an email message. However, Langseth
>
> teaches it in column 17, lines 30-34. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill
>
> in the art to combine the aforementioned inventions in order to break down into jobs for
>
> each of the message generators managed be a server control system within the data
>
> distribution server.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Olga Hernandez whose telephone number is (571) 272-7144.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 6:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, William Cuchlinski can be reached on (571) 272-3925. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Olga Hernandez
Examiner
Art Unit 2144